

REMARKS

Claims 11-37 are pending in the present application. By this amendment, claims 14 and 36 are amended. Claims 1-10 and 38-55 have been withdrawn. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present claims in view of the following remarks.

I. Specification

The Office Action alleges that the title of the invention is not descriptive and requires that a new title that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed be provided. Accordingly, Applicants have amended the title as set forth above to more clearly indicate the invention to which the claims are directed. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's suggested new title which was considered and partially used when amending the title. However, the recitation of "a Baseboard Management Controller" was not used in the title in place of "a Management Module" because the specification of the application describes that a baseboard management controller is just one example of a management module. *See* page 2, lines 4-6 of the specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the title of the application be withdrawn.

II. Claim Objections

Claim 36 is objected to because there are two periods after the claim. Accordingly, claim 36 has been amended to delete the duplicate period.

III. Claim Rejections

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In particular, the Office Action alleges that the recitation "comprises all industry-known components which may be communicatively connected to the management module" is exceedingly broad and ill defined in that it is not stated how such a method can encompass all different configurations possible.

Claim 14 has been amended to recite that “the set of components for which the description files are defined comprises components operative to communicatively connect to the management module.” Moreover, the specification of the present application describes that the components may be directly connected to the management module via contact pins of the management module or may be connected to the management module via a bus such as a system bus and/or management bus. Applicants respectfully submit that the subject matter of claim 14 is described in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains to make and/or use the invention. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 11-16, 20-21, 27-28, and 32-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Super Micro Computer, Inc. “IPMI View User Guide” (hereinafter “Super Micro”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A. Claims 11-16 and 20-21 are allowable.

Claim 11 recites that a computer-implemented method for customizing a management module for use in monitoring operation of components included in a configuration specified for a baseboard of a computer system comprises defining description files corresponding to a set of components which may be included in the configuration, wherein each component of the set is associated with a description file; providing a graphical user interface for modeling the configuration specified for the baseboard, wherein the user interacts with the graphical user interface to select one or more components included in the configuration; in response to user selection of one or more components on the graphical user interface, copying the device description file of each of the one or more selected components to a configuration file; and incorporating the configuration file into the management module such that the management module is programmed to receive information from the one or more selected components.

Super Micro does not teach or suggest a computer-implemented method for customizing a management module for use in monitoring operation of components included in a configuration specified for a baseboard of a computer system as recited by

claim 11 because Super Micro fails to teach or suggest every aspect of the claimed invention. On the contrary, Super Micro describes a method for sending Intelligent Platform Management Interface (IPMI) messages to and from a Base Management Card (BMC) on a remotely managed system. Super Micro describes an IPMI View window which includes a listing of computers with a BMC card that can be managed using the IPMI View; a listing of groups of computers (*i.e.*, any of the managed computers can be categorized into different groups) that can be managed using the IPMI View; and a viewing window which displays information about the managed computer selected including information and functions regarding the computer's BMC firmware, detailed information on the computer's Event Log for the BMC, detailed information of the sensors monitored by the BMC of the particular managed computer, and detailed information on the BMC LAN Configuration, SNMP trap configuration and serial communication port of the BMC. Super Micro describes using the IPMI View to add a new computer (system) to manage using the IPMI View, to add a new group of managed computers (systems) to manage using the IPMI View, to reload a previously saved IPMI View configuration, and to save a current IPMI View Configuration.

This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 11 because Super Micro fails to teach or suggest defining description files corresponding to a set of components which may be included in the configuration, wherein each component of the set is associated with a description file; providing a graphical user interface for modeling the configuration specified for the baseboard, wherein the user interacts with the graphical user interface to select one or more components included in the configuration; in response to user selection of one or more components on the graphical user interface, copying the device description file of each of the one or more selected components to a configuration file; and incorporating the configuration file into the management module such that the management module is programmed to receive information from the one or more selected components.

The Office Action alleges that the recitation "defining description files corresponding to a set of components which may be included in the configuration, wherein each component of the set is associated with a description file" of claim 11 is taught by Super Micro's description of using the IPMI View to add a new system to be

managed using the IPMI View. Applicants respectfully disagree. Super Micro describes adding a new system to be managed by the IPMI View by providing an “Add a new System” dialog box and receiving a system name, IP address associated with the system, and description of the system in the dialog box. This is not analogous to defining description files corresponding to a set of components which may be included in the configuration of a baseboard of a computer system because Super Micro fails to teach or suggest defining description files of components which may be included in the configuration of a baseboard of a computer system. Instead, Super Micro describes adding a new system to be managed by the IPMI View, without teaching or suggesting defining description files of components of a baseboard of the new system.

The Office Action further alleges that the recitation “providing a graphical user interface for modeling the configuration specified for the baseboard” of claim 11 is taught by Super Micro’s description of providing a listing of computers with a BMC card that can be managed using the IPMI View and providing a listing of groups of computers (*i.e.*, any of the managed computers can be categorized into different groups) that can be managed using the IPMI View. In particular, the Office Action notes that the IPMI Domain subwindow of the IPMI View taught by Super Micro shows the hierarchy of the system. Applicants respectfully disagree. Super Micro describes that any of the managed systems can be categorized into different groups to maintain systems easier and that all managed systems belong to the IPMI Domain even if the systems are joined in other groups. Thus, the IPMI Domain includes all the systems managed by the IPMI View, not the hierarchy of a particular system as suggested by the Office Action. Accordingly, Super Micro fails to teach or suggest providing a graphical user interface for modeling the configuration specified for the baseboard of a system because Super Micro teaches providing a listing of the systems that can be managed by the IPMI View, without teaching or suggesting providing a graphical user interface for modeling the configuration for the baseboard of a managed system.

Moreover, the Office Action alleges that the recitation “wherein the user interacts with the graphical user interface to select one or more components included in the configuration” of claim 11 is taught by Super Micro’s description of joining and disjoining managed systems from groups of systems. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Super Micro describes joining a managed system to a particular group of managed systems by selecting the system to be joined and the group in which the system is to be joined and selecting the “Edit>...Join...” commands and disjoining a managed system from a particular group of managed systems by selecting the system to be disjoined and the group to which the system is to be disjoined from and selecting the “Edit>...Disjoin...” commands, without teaching or suggesting that the user interacts with the IPMI View to select one or more components included in the configuration for the baseboard of a managed system.

The Office Action also alleges that the recitation “in response to user selection of one or more components on the graphical user interface, copying the device description file of each of the one or more selected components to a configuration file” of claim 11 is taught by Super Micro’s description of reload configuration. Applicants respectfully disagree. Super Micro describes loading the previous saved configuration in response to selection of the “File>Reload Configuration” commands, without teaching or suggesting copying a device description file of each of the one or more selected components to a configuration file. Nowhere does Super Micro teach or suggest that loading the previous saved configuration includes copying a device description file of each of the selected components included in a configuration for a baseboard of a managed system to a configuration file.

Finally, the Office Action alleges that the recitation “incorporating the configuration file into the management module such that the management module is programmed to receive information from the one or more selected components” of claim 11 is taught by Super Micro’s description of save configuration. Applicants respectfully disagree. Super Micro describes saving the current IPMI View configuration in response to selection of the “File>Save Configuration” commands, without teaching or suggesting incorporating a configuration file (which, as discussed above, includes the device description file of each of the selected components) into the BMC such that the BMC is programmed to receive information from the one or more selected components. In fact, nowhere does Super Micro describe incorporating a file into the BMC such that the BMC is programmed to receive information from selected components. Instead, Super Micro teaches viewing information about the BMC of a particular managed system including

information and function of the system's BMC firmware, information on the system's Event Log for the BMC, and information of the sensors monitored by the BMC of the system.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 11 is allowable over Super Micro. Since claims 12-16 and 20-21 depend from claim 11 and recite further claim features, Applicant respectfully submits that Super Micro does not anticipate Applicant's claimed invention as embodied in claims 12-16 and 20-21. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

B. Claims 27-28 and 32-37 are allowable.

Claim 27 recites that a system for customizing a management module responsible for monitoring operation of one or more components in a specific configuration specified for a baseboard of a computer system comprises a plurality of description files each describing a component in a set of components which may be included in the configuration; a graphical user interface through which a user selects one or more components from the set of components for inclusion in a model being constructed based on the configuration; and means for incorporating each device description file corresponding to the one or more selected components into a configuration file operable for loading into the management module to provide the management module with an ability to receive information from the one or more selected components.

Super Micro does not teach or suggest a system for customizing a management module responsible for monitoring operation of one or more components in a specific configuration specified for a baseboard of a computer system as recited by claim 27 because Super Micro fails to teach or suggest every aspect of the claimed invention. On the contrary, Super Micro describes an IPMI View for sending IPMI messages to and from a BMC on a remotely managed system. Super Micro describes that the IPMI View includes a window providing a listing of computers with a BMC card that can be managed using the IPMI View; a listing of groups of computers (*i.e.*, any of the managed computers can be categorized into different groups) that can be managed using the IPMI View; and a viewing window which displays information about the managed computer selected including information and functions regarding the computer's BMC firmware,

detailed information on the computer's Event Log for the BMC, detailed information of the sensors monitored by the BMC of the particular managed computer, and detailed information on the BMC LAN Configuration, SNMP trap configuration and serial communication port of the BMC. Super Micro describes that the IPMI View is operative to add a new computer (system) to manage using the IPMI View, to add a new group of managed computers (systems) to manage using the IPMI View, to reload a previously saved IPMI View configuration, and to save a current IPMI View Configuration.

This is not analogous to the system recited by claim 27 because Super Micro fails to teach or suggest a plurality of description files each describing a component in a set of components which may be included in the configuration; a graphical user interface through which a user selects one or more components from the set of components for inclusion in a model being constructed based on the configuration; and means for incorporating each device description file corresponding to the one or more selected components into a configuration file operable for loading into the management module to provide the management module with an ability to receive information from the one or more selected components.

The Office Action alleges that the recitation "a plurality of description files each describing a component in a set of components which may be included in the configuration" of claim 27 is taught by Super Micro's description of the IPMI View adding a new system to be managed using the IPMI View. Applicants respectfully disagree. Super Micro describes that the IPMI View adds a new system to be managed by the IPMI View by providing an "Add a new System" dialog box and receiving a system name, IP address associated with the system, and description of the system in the dialog box. This is not analogous to a plurality of description files each describing a component in a set of components which may be included in the configuration because Super Micro fails to teach or suggest a plurality of description files describing a component which may be included in the configuration of a baseboard of a computer system. Instead, Super Micro describes that the IPMI View adds a new system to be managed by the IPMI View, without teaching or suggesting a plurality of description files describing a component of a baseboard of the new system.

The Office Action further alleges that the recitation “a graphical user interface through which a user selects one or more components from the set of components for inclusion in a model being constructed based on the configuration” of claim 27 is taught by Super Micro’s description of the IPMI View providing a listing of computers with a BMC card that can be managed using the IPMI View and providing a listing of groups of computers (*i.e.*, any of the managed computers can be categorized into different groups) that can be managed using the IPMI View. In particular, the Office Action notes that the IPMI Domain subwindow of the IPMI View taught by Super Micro shows the hierarchy of the system. Applicants respectfully disagree. Super Micro describes that any of the managed systems can be categorized into different groups to maintain systems easier and that all managed systems belong to the IPMI Domain even if the systems are joined in other groups. Thus, the IPMI Domain includes all the systems managed by the IPMI View, not the hierarchy of a particular system as suggested by the Office Action. Accordingly, Super Micro fails to teach or suggest a graphical user interface through which a user selects one or more components from the set of components for inclusion in a model being constructed based on the configuration because Super Micro teaches that the IPMI View provides a listing of the systems that can be managed by the IPMI View, without teaching or suggesting that the IPMI View provides a graphical user interface through which a user selects components for inclusion in a model being constructed based on the configuration for the baseboard of a managed system.

Moreover, the Office Action alleges that the recitation “means for incorporating each device description file corresponding to the one or more selected components into a configuration file operable for loading into the management module to provide the management module with an ability to receive information from the one or more selected components” of claim 27 is taught by Super Micro’s description of the IPMI View providing a save configuration. Applicants respectfully disagree. Super Micro describes that the IPMI View saves the current IPMI View configuration in response to selection of the “File>Save Configuration” commands, without teaching or suggesting that the IPMI View incorporates device description files corresponding to the one or more selected components into a configuration file operable for loading into the BMC to provide the BMC with the ability to receive information from the one or more selected components.

In fact, nowhere does Super Micro describe that the IPMI View loads a file into the BMC to provide the BMC with the ability to receive information from selected components. Instead, Super Micro teaches that the IPMI View provides information about the BMC of a particular managed system including information and function of the system's BMC firmware, information on the system's Event Log for the BMC, and information of the sensors monitored by the BMC of the system.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 27 is allowable over Super Micro. Since claims 28 and 32-37 depend from claim 27 and recite further claim features, Applicant respectfully submits that Super Micro does not anticipate Applicant's claimed invention as embodied in claims 28 and 32-37. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 17-19, 22-26, and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Super Micro. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A. Claims 17-19 and 22-26 are allowable.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 11 is allowable over Super Micro. Since claims 17-19 and 22-26 depend from claim 11 and recite further claim features, Applicant respectfully submits that Super Micro does not make obvious Applicant's claimed invention as embodied in claims 17-19 and 22-26.

Claims 17-19 and 22-26 are also allowable over Super Micro for other reasons. For instance, with regard to claim 17, Super Micro fails to teach or suggest receiving a command from a user through the window provided by the IPMI View selecting a first component and requesting a connection of the first component to a contact pin of the BMC. Instead, Super Micro describes providing information about the BMC of a particular managed system through the IPMI View, without teaching or suggesting receiving a command selecting a first component and requesting a connection between the first component and a contact pin of the BMC. Further, with regard to claim 22, Super Micro fails to teach or suggest receiving a command from a user through the window provided by the IPMI View selecting a first component, wherein the user enters

the command by dragging a first graphical icon representing the first component from the first portion to the second portion. On the contrary, Super Micro describes providing information about the BMC of a particular managed system through the IPMI View, without teaching or suggesting receiving a command from a user wherein the user enters the command by dragging a graphical icon representing a first component that may be included in a configuration for a baseboard of a managed system from a first portion to a second portion of the IPMI View. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

B. Claims 29-31 are allowable.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 27 is allowable over Super Micro. Since claims 29-31 depend from claim 27 and recite further claim features, Applicant respectfully submits that Super Micro does not make obvious Applicant's claimed invention as embodied in claims 29-31.

Claims 29-31 are also allowable over Super Micro for other reasons. For instance, with regard to claim 29, Super Micro fails to teach or suggest that a user selects one or more components for inclusion in the model being constructed based on the configuration for a baseboard of a managed system by dragging a first graphical icon representing the first component from a first portion into a second portion of the IPMI View. Instead, Super Micro describes that the IPMI View provides information about the BMC of a particular managed system, without teaching or suggesting that a user selects one or more components for inclusion in the model being constructed based on the configuration for a baseboard of a managed system by dragging a first graphical icon representing the first component from a first portion into a second portion of the IPMI View. In fact, Super Micro does not mention any functionality of the IPMI View for allowing a user to construct a model based on the configuration for a baseboard of a managed system. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least these reasons, Applicants assert that the pending claims 11-37 are in condition for allowance. Applicants further assert that this response addresses each and every point of the Office Action, and respectfully request that the Examiner pass this application with claims 11-37 to allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact Applicants' attorney at 404.522.1100.

Respectfully submitted,

HOPE BALDAUFF HARTMAN, LLC

Date: November 28, 2006

Hope Baldauff Hartman, LLC
P.O. Box 2825
Atlanta, Georgia 30301
Telephone: 404.522.1100

/Jodi L. Hartman/
Jodi L. Hartman
Reg. No. 55,251

